D. T. SHEPILOV

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION

Д. Т. ШЕПИЛОВ

ВОПРОСЫ МЕЖДУНАРОДНОГО ПОЛОЖЕНИЯ И ВНЕШНЕЙ ПОЛИТИКИ СОВЕТСКОГО СОЮЗА

D. T. SHEPILOV

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION

Report to the Sixth Session
of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.
February 12, 1957

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE
Moscow 1957

CONTENTS

Page

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION. *Report to the Sixth Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., February 12, 1957*

I. Two Foreign Policy Lines 6

II. The Socialist Camp Has Been and Remains the Chief Stronghold of Peace and Security of the Peoples 18

III. Aggravation of Contradictions Between the Principal Capitalist Powers . 28

IV. For Peace, Friendship and Co-operation Between the Nations 37

DECISION OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R. *on the Report by the U.S.S.R. Foreign Minister D. T. Shepilov on the International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union* 58

Comrade Deputies,

The current session of the Supreme Soviet has approved the State Plan for the Development of the U.S.S.R. National Economy and the State Budget for 1957. It has thereby defined the vital tasks of the further development of the socialist economy, raising the standard of living and advancing Soviet culture. Realization of these grand tasks will be a big step towards fulfilment of the Sixth Five-Year Plan, towards construction of communism in our country.

In adopting the national-economic plan and the budget for the current year, the session cannot but discuss the more important aspects of the international situation in which the Soviet people are doing their great constructive work.

The past year was not wanting in major international developments.

We all remember the recent past, which was marked by a substantial *lessening* of international tension achieved through the efforts of the peace-loving countries and the broad public throughout the world. A weighty contribution to the lessening of international tension was made by the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the other People's Democracies.

Also fresh in the memory of all are the events of last autumn which aggravated the world situation and

heightened international tension. These events were the product of aggressive action undertaken by the imperialist circles with a view to bolstering their steadily weakening positions in the East, restoring the colonial regime there, undermining the unity of the socialist camp countries and poisoning the international atmosphere by a policy of provocation and outright military gambles.

Thus a struggle was precipitated between the forces upholding peace, universal security and social progress, and the forces of reaction and imperialist aggression.

I. TWO FOREIGN POLICY LINES

Our great teacher Lenin substantiated in his works the possibility and the necessity of *peaceful co-existence of the two systems*, the socialist and the capitalist.

Drawing on Lenin's theses and on the experience of the recent decades, the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union formulated propositions of great theoretical force and practical significance: a) the peaceful co-existence of the two systems; b) the possibility of averting wars in our time; and c) forms of transition to socialism in different countries.

The policy of the peaceful co-existence of the two diametrically opposed social systems is not a transient political manoeuvre thought up by the Soviet state, as alleged by our adversaries. No, *it is the corner-stone of the foreign policy of the Soviet state.* Our foreign policy is based on the immutable principles of respect for the sovereign rights of all countries, big and small, strict non-interference in the domestic affairs of other countries, and complete equality in relations with them.

The Soviet Government has done much in recent years to secure a lessening of international tension. It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union actively helped stop the war in Korea in 1953, extinguish the flames of war in Indo-China in 1954, and settle the Austrian question. Soviet-Yugoslav relations have been normalized on the initiative of the Soviet Government. Diplomatic relations have been established between the U.S.S.R. and the Federal Republic of Germany. A friendly exchange of opinions took place at the Geneva Conference of the Heads of Government of the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain and France in the summer of 1955; as a result, the Heads of Government of the Four Powers unanimously announced their desire "to contribute to easing international tension and strengthening confidence among states," and their desire "to avert the danger of war and to ease the burden of armaments."

We are especially glad to note the strengthening of friendly co-operation between the Soviet Union and such a Great Power as India, and also with Indonesia, Egypt, Syria, Afghanistan, Burma and other countries of Asia and Africa. Our people welcomed the establishment of diplomatic relations with Cambodia, the Sudan, Ceylon, Tunisia, Liberia and Nepal. They sympathize with the selfless struggle waged by the peoples of the East against the outmoded colonial system of imperialism.

The year 1956 was marked by a certain improvement of the political situation in the Far East. The normalization of relations between the U.S.S.R. and Japan, opening up good prospects for business co-operation between the two countries, has been of great importance in this respect.

Personal contacts between Soviet and foreign statesmen have been extended considerably. It is difficult to overestimate the political significance of the visits paid by Comrades Bulganin and Khrushchov to India, Burma, Afghanistan and Great Britain. Comrade Voroshilov's visit to Finland, Comrade Mikoyan's visit to Asian countries, and visits by other leaders also yielded favourable results.

During the past year, the Soviet Union was visited by statesmen and public figures from the fraternal People's Democracies. The Soviet people gave a warm, cordial welcome to the envoys of the socialist countries: Comrade Chu Teh, Vice-Chairman of the Chinese People's Republic, the Chinese Government Delegation headed by Comrade Chou En-lai, the Government Delegation from the Korean People's Democratic Republic led by Comrade Kim Il Sung, the Government Delegation from the German Democratic Republic led by Comrades Otto Grotewohl and Walter Ulbricht, the Delegation from the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party and the Government of the Polish People's Republic headed by Comrades Wladyslaw Gomulka and Josef Cyrankiewicz, the Government Delegation from the Rumanian People's Republic headed by Comrade Chivu Stoica, the Delegation from the Czechoslovak Republic led by Comrades Antonin Zápotocký, Antonin Novotný and Viliam Široký.

A warm welcome was given to Comrade Josip Broz-Tito, President of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia.

The friendly relations between the Soviet Union and the Eastern countries have been greatly strengthened by the visits to the Soviet Union of Mr. Nehru, Prime Min-

ister of the Republic of India, and Mr. Radhakrishnan, Vice-President of the Republic of India, Mr. Sukarno, President of the Republic of Indonesia, His Majesty the Shah of Iran Mohammed Reza Pahlevi, Mr. Kuwatly, President of the Syrian Republic, U Nu, Prime Minister of Burma, Mohammed el-Badr, Deputy Prime Minister of Yemen, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Heir Apparent of Cambodia, Mr. Ichiro Hatoyama, Prime Minister of Japan, and Sardar Mohammed Daoud, Prime Minister of Afghanistan.

Our good-neighbourly relations with Finland have been further strengthened by the visits to our country of the late President Paasikivi, of Finland, the present President Kekkonen and Prime Minister Fagerholm.

Mutual understanding and the growth of business cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the West have been furthered by the visits to our country of Prime Minister Gerhardsen, of Norway, Prime Minister Hansen, of Denmark, Prime Minister Erlander, of Sweden, the French Government Delegation headed by Prime Minister Mollet, and the Belgian Government Delegation led by Prime Minister Van Acker.

Exchange of numerous parliamentary delegations, begun on the initiative of the Soviet Union, developed fruitfully last year, and the Soviet Union's international economic and cultural relations were broadened.

The definite easing of the international tension opened the way for reducing the heavy burden imposed on mankind by the arms race. The Soviet Government worked hard to end the disarmament deadlock. It effected a unilateral and substantial reduction in the Armed Forces by 1,840,000 men and cut military appropriations accordingly. In January 1956 the Soviet Union turned

over to Finland its military base at Porkkala-Udd. China, Poland, Czechoslovakia and other People's Democracies likewise substantially reduced their armed forces and military expenditure.

On November 17, 1956, the Soviet Government put forward new and important disarmament proposals which considerably facilitate the possibility of agreement on this matter.

How did the leading Western Powers respond to the sincere striving to strengthen peace displayed by the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and all other peace-loving forces?

Facts show that a struggle between *two foreign-policy trends* is taking place among the ruling circles of these Powers. The more far-sighted statesmen realize that the national interests of their countries call for relaxation of international tension. However, another, an opposite trend won the upper hand in the policy of these countries towards the end of 1956.

The way of closer co-operation between the nations obviously does not suit the adherents of this second trend, who place their selfish interests above those of the nation, above the interests of peace and security. That is why far from supporting the initiative of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states designed to improve the international situation they resorted to open attacks in two main directions—against the national-liberation movement in the East and against the great community of the socialist nations.

It follows, therefore, that certain imperialist circles are, in effect, relinquishing the idea of peaceful co-existence and, as in the past, banking on settling international problems by force.

An important part in all this, of course, is played by the fact that the monopolists are using the international tension for an unbridled arms race. After all, military orders yield huge profits.

It is common knowledge that the NATO countries have spent over 364,000 million dollars on armaments in the seven years since the bloc was formed. A further increase—approximately 5-8 per cent—in NATO military appropriations is planned for 1957. The United States is now spending as much on arms as it did during the war. From 1940 to 1945, for instance, the United States spent an annual average of 42,200 million dollars on military purposes. Its 1957-58 budget provides for an expenditure of 45,300 million dollars on military needs. Payments under commitments incurred during past wars bring the total to 57,300 million dollars — 77 per cent of all budget expenditure. A military budget on this scale is a bonanza for the monopolies specializing in armaments. And the last thing any of them wants is less profit.

However, there were other factors as well. After the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. the ill-starred bourgeois strategists incorrectly interpreted the criticism we made of our mistakes and shortcomings in the different spheres of Party life and state affairs, criticism which reflects the inviolable monolithic unity of our Leninist Party and the remarkable vitality of the Soviet social system. Wishful thinking led them to count on some kind of "evolution" of the Soviet system, on our renunciation of "some aspects" of the dictatorship of the proletariat and that we would become, if not actually "white," at least "pink." In anticipation of this "evolution" certain quarters in the West took pains for a time to veil the sub-

stance of their anti-Soviet policy by peace-sounding phrases. This verbal loyalty, however, concealed intensified subversive operations designed to undermine the unity of the socialist camp.

Clearly the strategists of the bourgeois world incorrectly assessed the strength of the national-liberation movements in the East. They continued to count on strengthening and even extending imperialist domination in those areas of the world where the peoples after centuries of oppression have risen in the sacred struggle for freedom and independence.

Then, when the imperialists became convinced of the steadily growing might of the socialist countries, of the growing moral and political unity of their peoples and that any calculation on an "evolution" of the Soviet system in the direction of a bourgeois regime was but an empty fantasy, when they realized that their dreams of preserving and consolidating the system of colonial slavery in the East were castles in the air, they fell back once more on the poisoned weapon of anti-popular conspiracies and military gambles.

This explains the aggression of Britain, France and Israel against Egypt, and the counter-revolutionary putsch in Hungary, which formed part of a single broadly conceived strategic plan.

The sponsors of this plan counted on changing the international situation in their favour by two blows. They overestimated, however, their strength and underestimated the strength of the camp of socialism as well as the strength of the national-liberation movement in the countries of the East. (*Applause.*) They badly miscalculated and sustained a twofold counter-blow of crushing force. (*Stormy applause.*)

Comrade Deputies,

On the ancient soil of Egypt the forces of imperialism decided to give battle not only to the Egyptian people but to all the peoples of Asia and Africa fighting for their freedom and independence. In doing so they challenged the cause of peace, freedom and democracy throughout the world.

Their calculations, however, came to naught. The courageous struggle waged by the Egyptian people, supported by the entire Arab world, the firm and resolute stand taken on this issue by the socialist countries, the Republic of India, and all the peace-loving forces, decisively influenced the events. The aggression against Egypt failed. Its lessons are highly instructive.

Britain and France, to say nothing of Israel which was assigned the unseemly role of provoking the aggression, sustained above all a *military defeat*. Their troops, by virtue of the reasons cited above, far from bringing Egypt to her knees, far from occupying the entire Suez Canal zone—the immediate purpose of the aggression—failed to get a complete grip of even a single strong point—Port Said. This circumstance, in particular, provided a pretext for the vast "press empire" of the United States to beat the drums with assertions to the effect that Britain and France are no longer numbered among the Great Powers.

Britain and France also sustained *economic defeat*, for the war has seriously aggravated their economic difficulties and made them much more dependent on the United States. It should be borne in mind that some 30 per cent of British imports and exports passed through the Suez Canal in 1955. The blocking of the canal caused a complex chain reaction throughout the economic or-

ganism of the country. The flow of Middle East oil, which accounted for 80 per cent of British oil consumption in 1955, sharply declined. And this in a country where the furnaces producing 40 per cent of the steel use oil fuel, as is the case also with a considerable part of the non-ferrous metallurgy, chemical, ceramics, paper industry and other branches. Britain, like many other West-European countries, has been forced to purchase American oil at high prices. But this has jeopardized her dollar reserves, small as they are, and intensified her financial dependence on the United States. France is in the same predicament.

Finally, Britain and France suffered a grave *moral and political defeat* in the war against Egypt. Their influence in the East has been seriously undermined. As for the Israeli aggressors, their action evoked indignation and protests on the part of millions far beyond the Arab world.

Such are the lessons of the gamble undertaken by the colonialists in the Arab East. It would seem that they should have sobered those who up to now have refused to march in step with the times. Nevertheless, to this day the imperialists are continuing their intrigues against the Arab East, first and foremost against Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Yemen and Saudi Arabia, which cannot but alarm all the peace-loving peoples.

However, those who continue playing with fire would do well to remember that neither outright war gambles nor covert intrigues can withstand the action of the irresistible laws of social development. There is no force that could impose a regime of alien domination on peoples who have risen in struggle for their liberation. (*Applause.*) The building up of aggressive military blocs like the Baghdad Pact and SEATO, establishing military bases in

foreign countries and other manifestations of the "positions of strength" policy can but aggravate the contradictions and speed up the process of the final abolition of the colonial system which has outlived itself. "He who sows the wind will reap the whirlwind."

It will be recalled that recently the forces of international reaction also launched a direct subversive operation against the socialist camp. This operation had been long and thoroughly prepared. It had been prepared by the instigations emanating from such centres of ideological intervention, belonging to the United States Government, as the "Voice of America" radio station. It had been prepared by United States subversive agencies, operating under the mask of "private institutions," such as the "Crusade for Freedom" and its "Free Europe" radio centre, the "Committee for Struggle against Bolshevism" and others disposing of powerful means of radio communications, devices for launching balloons carrying counter-revolutionary leaflets, etc.

The United States Government officially allocates vast sums for espionage and sabotage against the U.S.S.R. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic and the other socialist states. During the last six years the U.S. Congress has appropriated for this purpose over 600 million dollars. These funds are used to finance subversive gangs and military units drawn from the reactionary emigrant scum, for sending spies and provocateurs into the People's Democracies to form underground counter-revolutionary organizations from the remnants of the internal reactionary elements.

International reaction, exploiting the grave mistakes made by the former Hungarian leadership and playing on chauvinist and nationalist survivals, banked on

confusing and deceiving the Hungarian people. The organizers of the putsch intended to wrest Hungary from the socialist camp, to make a breach in the community of the free countries, split them, and then try to weaken and crush them one after another.

There is no doubt that a victory for the counter-revolution in Hungary would have been followed by the physical annihilation of many thousands of sons and daughters of the Hungarian people, of workers, peasants and intelligentsia, and would have led to the restoration of the fascist regime. Hungary would have become a dangerous centre of war in the heart of Europe. But the working class, the peasantry, all toilers in the Hungarian People's Republic divined what the Eszterházys and Mindszentys, the big landowners and capitalists, the ringleaders of fascist-monarchist and clerical reaction had in store for them. The people, led by the Socialist Workers' Party and the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government, aided by the Soviet Union, quickly smashed the counter-revolutionary plotters. This was a major victory for peace and socialism. (*Stormy applause.*) In coming to the aid of the people the U.S.S.R. discharged its international duty to the working people of Hungary and the other socialist countries, which corresponds to the interests of world peace.

The working people of the Republic aided by the fraternal peoples are now healing the wounds inflicted on the country by the counter-revolutionary uprising. They are getting things going in town and country, taking broad measures for further developing the democratic principles of the people's system in order to ensure a steady advance in the material well-being of the citizens and cultural progress in a socialist Hungary.

Thus, *the defeat in Hungary of the counter-revolutionary uprising instigated from abroad and the defeat sustained by the aggressors in Egypt signify a serious fiasco for the imperialist "positions of strength" policy and are further proof of the steady weakening of the capitalist system.*

The attempts by definite imperialist circles to try out direct military-putsch methods of struggle against the countries of the socialist camp by no means testify to the strength of the enemies of communism. On the contrary. Lenin, commenting on enemy attacks, pointed out that "very often the fury of the attacks and the loudness of the barking are in inverse ratio to the strength of the political element launching the furious attacks." *

The events in Hungary and in the Middle East, the rapid isolation and failure of the plotters and aggressors have confirmed the correctness and viability of the theses of the 20th Party Congress that in present conditions war is not a fatal inevitability, that wars can be prevented and nipped in the bud, that with the existing correlation of forces in the international arena the sole realistic policy is that of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems. The imperialists had to learn from bitter experience the irrefutable truth that the forces opposing aggression today are legion and that putting them to the test is not without danger.

The events in Egypt and in Hungary have shown, on the other hand, how timely and important was the warning voiced by the 20th Congress of our Party which, while proclaiming the policy of peaceful co-existence, emphasized: "...It is necessary to display the greatest

---

* V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 27, p. 250.

vigilance. As long as capitalism survives in the world, the reactionary forces representing the interests of the capitalist monopolies will continue their drive towards military gambles and aggression, and may try to unleash war."

Peaceful co-existence does not mean a quiet life. For as long as different social and political systems exist, contradictions between them are inevitable. Peaceful co-existence presupposes struggle—political struggle, economic struggle and ideological struggle. The existence of states with different social and political systems does not imply the fatal inevitability of war. To co-exist means not to quarrel with one another, not to settle international issues by force of arms, but to compete in peaceful labour and economic and cultural activity. But we would cease to be Marxists-Leninists if we forgot the elementary laws of social life, the laws of class struggle.

Consistent and firm application of the general line of our Party in the foreign policy of the Soviet state—the line of easing international tension and establishing business co-operation between states—must at the same time be organically combined with unsleeping vigilance so that no intrigues of the enemies of communism shall interfere with our peaceful constructive labour. (*Applause.*)

II. THE SOCIALIST CAMP HAS BEEN AND REMAINS THE CHIEF STRONGHOLD OF PEACE AND SECURITY OF THE PEOPLES

The great community of the socialist countries which unites in fraternal bonds the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Chinese People's Republic, the People's Republic of Albania, the People's Republic of Bulgaria,

the Hungarian People's Republic, the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, the German Democratic Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic has been and remains the impregnable fortress of peace and security of the peoples. The socialist camp with its steadily growing economic, political and ideological might is a vital factor in world affairs. It exerts a favourable influence on the entire international situation.

The Great October Socialist Revolution ushered in a new era. It paved the way for building socialist society not only in our country. After the defeat of German fascism and Japanese imperialism, a whole number of European and Asian countries took the socialist road. Rallying around the U.S.S.R., they formed an unprecedented fraternal alliance of peoples, whose programme is the building of the highest, harmonious social system—communism.

The growth and consolidation of this great community have led to the emergence of the *socialist world system of economy*, of which the world market of the countries of the socialist camp is a component. This system, which is growing stronger and rapidly advancing, differs fundamentally from the capitalist world system of economy which has outlived itself and is on the downgrade.

The countries of the socialist camp are developing on the basis of qualitatively new *economic laws*. Unprecedented motive forces have come into action here. The immense superiority of the new social and state system is making itself felt more and more. *International*

relations of a new type have taken shape in the process of fraternal co-operation between the countries of the socialist camp.

It is common knowledge that the socialist countries are at different stages of economic and technological development. Under capitalism these differences would make possible the subjugation of the less developed countries by those economically powerful. Under socialism these relations are absolutely precluded. The ties between the socialist countries are based on full equality, respect for territorial integrity, state independence and sovereignty, on non-interference in each other's internal affairs. Notwithstanding the differences deriving from the past of each country, national peculiarities and level of economic development, the partners in the world system of socialism are linked by unity of purpose and identity of vital interests—all have taken the road of building socialist society.

The immutable foundation of the state system of all countries of the socialist camp is *social ownership* of the means of production, socialist production relations, which presuppose the complete abolition of exploitation of man by man. This epoch-making objective has already been reached in the Soviet Union. Planned socialist economy precludes the anarchy of production and destructive economic crises inherent in capitalism.

The relations between the socialist countries rest on the foundations of *comradely co-operation and mutual aid.* This makes it possible to raise economically underdeveloped countries to the level of advanced ones and completely abolish the former economic and cultural backwardness of some peoples. On the basis of the socialist internation-

al division of labour each country can make the best use of its natural resources, rapidly advance its national economy and in this way ensure a steady rise in living standards. This is the great advantage of the socialist international division of labour, co-ordination of economic activity, specialization and co-operation of production, while taking into account the economic peculiarities of each country.

The growing might of the socialist camp is the firmest and the most reliable guarantee of the freedom, independence and sovereignty of *each* socialist state taken separately. That is why each socialist state in its turn is vitally interested in strengthening and developing the *entire* socialist camp. Thus, the alliance of the socialist nations demonstrates the tremendous vitality of proletarian internationalism, which harmoniously combines the *national interests* of the separate socialist countries with the *common interests* of the community of free peoples, with the interests of all the working people uniting them in the struggle for the complete victory of the grand ideas of peace, democracy and socialism.

Lenin wrote: "As long as national and state differences exist among peoples and countries—and these differences will continue to exist for a very long time even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a world scale—the unity of international tactics of the communist working-class movement of all countries demands, not the elimination of variety, not the abolition of national differences (that is a foolish dream at the present moment), but such an application of the *fundamental* principles of communism (Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat) as will *correctly modify* these principles in certain *particulars*,

correctly adapt and apply them to national and national-state differences." *

And so, a correct appraisal of the national and national-state peculiarities of each country far from dividing, on the contrary, helps to *unite* the socialist countries, helps to weld them more closely.

The advantages of the new mode of production, the increasingly closer relations of fraternal co-operation and mutual aid between the free countries are decisive for the rapid economic development of all the countries of the socialist camp, for a steady rise in living standards and culture. It is sufficient to say that in 1956 gross industrial output in the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies exceeded the pre-war level more than fourfold, while in the capitalist countries the increase was but 90 per cent. In 1956 the pre-war level of industrial production was exceeded: in the German Democratic Republic—2.2 times, in Czechoslovakia—more than 2.7 times, in Rumania—almost 3.3 times, in Hungary—3.2 times, in Poland—more than fivefold, in Bulgaria—over sixfold, in Albania—about elevenfold, etc. The great China has made tremendous progress in industrial development. Dozens of branches of industry, equipped with first-class machinery, have been built or are in the process of construction. In the past five years the pace of industrial development in the socialist countries was 2.6 times faster than that in the capitalist countries.

The imperialists try hard to obstruct the development of the socialist states. This is the special purpose of the American policy of economic discrimination against

---

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 420.

the free countries, the embargo on trading with People's China, and economic pressure on the countries of socialism.

Seeking to undermine and split the unity of the socialist camp, the imperialists exploit chauvinism, narrow nationalistic sentiments and other vestiges of the past not yet fully outlived in some countries. They seek to divide the socialist countries, concentrating specifically on the so-called "national communism" which has gained currency of late. But their efforts are doomed to failure, for the relations between the socialist countries neither know, nor can they know, unsurmountable contradictions and conflict of interests. Of course some mistakes, difficulties and shortcomings are inevitable in the life of a great family of peoples. But according as these shortcomings and mistakes are revealed they are overcome and eliminated.

In keeping with the historic decisions of the 20th C.P.S.U. Congress the Government of the Soviet Union has on its part taken the necessary measures to eliminate anything which might give rise to unevenness and misunderstanding in the relations between the fraternal countries. The "Declaration of U.S.S.R. Government on Principles of Development and Further Strengthening Friendship and Co-Operation Between the Soviet Union and the Other Socialist Countries," published on October 30, 1956, contains a precise formulation of the principles of proletarian internationalism as applied to the present stage of the fraternal co-operation between the countries of the socialist camp.

Guided by this Declaration, the Soviet Government has in recent months conducted bilateral talks with the governments of the Polish People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the German Democratic

Republic, the Chinese People's Republic and the Czechoslovak Republic. The relations between the Soviet Union and the other socialist states were thoroughly and comprehensively discussed during these talks which took place in an atmosphere of cordiality and friendship, in the spirit of complete mutual understanding and candour. The decisions adopted ensure further improvement and extension of the political, economic and cultural co-operation. The outcome of the talks has once again convincingly shown to the whole world the unbreakable friendship and cohesion of the socialist community. (*Applause.*)

The further strengthening of the unity and fraternal co-operation between the socialist states is particularly important in view of the fact that the imperialists are stepping up their subversive activity against them. Unity and fraternal co-operation are the supreme international duty of all fighters for socialism. And any action which violates this is detrimental to the cause of peace, democracy and socialism.

In the present situation, when the aggressive blocs of the imperialist powers are operating and the chief military alignment of imperialism—the Atlantic pact including a remilitarized Western Germany—is stepping up its preparations for war, the countries of the socialist camp have had to assume reciprocal military commitments under the Warsaw Treaty. And as long as imperialist blocs exist, as long as there are military bases on foreign territory, it is the sacred duty of all socialist states to strengthen the Warsaw Treaty organization. (*Applause.*)

Comrade Deputies! A vital factor making for the might of the socialist camp is the friendship between

the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic which is confidently building socialism and advancing along the road of progress and prosperity. We Soviet people take pride in the outstanding success of the Chinese people. (*Applause.*) This friendship and fraternal alliance between the great socialist powers constitutes a bastion of peace and security for all nations, for one would have to lose the last vestige of reason to raise the sword against the powerful fortress of socialism garrisoned by 900 million people headed by the brother nations—the Chinese and Soviet peoples. (*Stormy applause.*)

In summing up the recent talks in Moscow the Soviet Government and the Chinese Government Delegation headed by Comrade Chou En-lai noted with greatest satisfaction that the friendship and co-operation between the U.S.S.R. and China have been comprehensively developed since the conclusion of the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Aid in 1950. The peoples of the Soviet Union and China are united *forever.* (*Applause.*) The two countries have declared that they are linked with all the socialist countries by bonds of fraternal friendship and mutual aid, that any provocative actions by the aggressive imperialist forces, aimed at undermining the socialist countries, will meet with the most resolute rebuff. (*Applause.*)

Characterizing the great principles underlying the friendship of the socialist states, Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out:

"The forces stemming from this friendship are boundless, inexhaustible and really inconquerable.

"Let all imperialist aggressors and warmongers tremble before our great friendship." (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

In the middle of the 19th century Marx told a story about a German missionary who spent 20 years in China and saw, as he put it, the "rebellious plebs," heard people who spoke about the poverty of some and the riches of others, and who demanded a redistribution of property. Later, upon learning about European socialism, the missionary arrived at the conclusion: "This means that I will never be able to get away from this disastrous teaching." This impelled Marx to query whether it might not be the case that sometime in the future the European reactionaries, having reached the great wall of China, would read the inscription: "The Chinese Republic. Liberty. Equality. Fraternity." * (*Animation in the hall. Applause.*) And now, a century later, the European reactionaries can really see at the gateway to the Great China the words: "The Chinese People's Republic." (*Stormy applause.*) At the helm of state is a Party which has taken as its banner the immortal teaching of Marx and Lenin. Today the European and American reactionaries can really say that they cannot get away from the all-conquering ideas of communism! (*Applause.*)

Comrades, the task of upholding peace unites all the countries of the socialist camp. Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia recently met in Budapest and declared their "firm resolve to use the might of the socialist system and their influence to foil the attempts of the aggressive forces to further aggravate the international situation, to intensify the arms race and fan war

---

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. VII. pp. 133-234.

psychosis." The same will was clearly reflected in the Soviet-Chinese, Chinese-Polish and Chinese-Hungarian negotiations, and also in the talks between the government delegations of the U.S.S.R. and Poland, the U.S.S.R. and the German Democratic Republic, the U.S.S.R. and Rumania, and the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia.

I have already said that as a result of the efforts made by the Government of the Soviet Union, which were met halfway by the Government of Yugoslavia, relations have been normalized. We shall continue to take all necessary steps to ensure successful development of Soviet-Yugoslav relations on a basis of friendship and equality. At present, however, this depends chiefly on the leaders of the Yugoslav Republic, inasmuch as in Yugoslavia there are still manifestations of ill will and even direct attacks on the U.S.S.R. and a number of People's Democracies on the part of certain elements. We regret this, because these facts, undoubtedly, hamper our common cause.

Comrade Deputies, the corner-stone of the policy of the socialist states is consolidation of peace and international security and defence of peaceful international co-operation against encroachment by aggressive circles.

Life itself suggests to the ruling circles of the capitalist world the only sensible and possible outlet—abandon, at last, all thought about "rolling back communism," and take the road of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems. Should this principle triumph in international policy, peace will be preserved and consolidated. (*Applause.*)

III. AGGRAVATION OF CONTRADICTIONS BETWEEN THE PRINCIPAL CAPITALIST POWERS

In analyzing the international situation we cannot, naturally, ignore the major shifts that have taken place of late in the correlation of forces in the capitalist camp.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin disclosed with remarkable insight the basic laws of the last, final stage of capitalism. He proved that in the epoch of imperialism, due to *the law of uneven, spasmodic development of the capitalist countries*, profound changes take place in the relation of economic and military might of the different imperialist powers. These changes in turn inevitably lead to an aggravation of the imperialists' struggle for the redivision of the colonies and spheres of influence.

Lenin exploded the apologist theory of bourgeois sociologists and economists according to which the development of capitalism can lead to termination of the struggle between competing capitalist powers, to some kind of "ultra-imperialism," to the dying down of the inner imperialist contradictions. Life has fully confirmed the correctness of Lenin's thesis in the new conditions of today as well.

The rise of the socialist world system has considerably reduced the zone of capitalist exploitation. Simultaneously the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism has been accelerated. These circumstances, far from weakening, *intensify* the action of the law of uneven development of capitalism.

The past year strikingly revealed the growing changes in the balance of forces within the capitalist camp: U.S. domination is becoming more and more pronounced; the international positions of Britain and France are weakening sharply; Western Germany's role becomes

greater; Japan is gathering strength. All this tends to deepen and aggravate the contradictions within the imperialist camp.

The growing United States domination in the capitalist world and the sharp weakening of the international positions of Britain and France are two sides of the same medal. The United States is waging a methodical offensive against the British system of preferential imperial tariffs, seeking to remove the barrier of the sterling zone. It is not only invading the British Empire and France's overseas territories with goods, it is exporting capital to them on an ever larger scale.

The struggle between the United States and Britain has reached its acme in the Middle East. In the postwar years the United States has ousted Britain from her decisive positions in oil production in this area. In 1937, for instance, the United States accounted for only about 13 per cent of oil extraction in the Middle East—Britain for over 80 per cent. The picture has changed radically today. By 1956 the United States had control of almost 60 per cent of the Middle East oil extraction and Britain about one-third.

The Middle East has become the arena of bitter struggle between the old but weakened colonial empires, Britain and France, and the new, more powerful American empire. Naturally, all three are united in their desire to crush the Arab peoples' movement for national freedom and independence. But the United States wants to do so in a way that will enable it in the final count to become master of all the oil resources and strategic bridge-heads in this area. Significant in this respect was the recent statement by the U.S. Secretary of State Dulles who, speaking of the Middle East, bluntly declared: "Person-

ally, I' rather not have a French and British soldier beside me, one on my right and one on my left." The statement evoked indignation in Paris and London.

It should be emphasized that the primary purpose of the American "aid" to the Arab countries is to subordinate them to American control. Mention should be made of the fact that all forms of American "aid" to the Arab countries over the past seven years totalled a mere 136 million dollars, while the U.S. Aramco Oil Company alone pockets over 300 million dollars a year from exploiting the natural wealth of Saudi Arabia. *Consequently, America's annual "aid" to the Arab countries does not exceed five per cent of the profits of one private American company in one Arab country!*

As a result of the failure of Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggression against Egypt, America's supremacy over its rivals has increased. Now, relying on this new correlation of forces, the United States aims at completely ousting Britain and France from the Middle East. This is strikingly confirmed by the "Eisenhower doctrine" according to which the United States intends to cover the area with a network of atomic bases, flood it with troops and, at the opportune moment, launch a war of aggression from that area.

At the dawn of the century President Theodore Roosevelt declared: "Speak softly and carry a big stick, you will go far." The method of the stick and carrot is well to the fore in the new doctrine. But sweet words cannot conceal the designs of the American imperialists.

American foreign policy has known not a few doctrines. Towards the end of the last century Secretary of State Hay announced the doctrine of the "open door" in China. What was its essence? It was America's claim to

participation in the colonial subjugation of China. The "Eisenhower doctrine" can be classified as the "*doctrine of the closed door in the Middle East in the interests of the United States.*" It is designed to hitch this area exclusively to the American chariot.

The advocates of the "Eisenhower doctrine" contend that it helps... to put into effect the United Nations principles of respect for national sovereignty and independence and the right of nations to self-determination. It is difficult to understand who they have in mind when they make these assertions which turn universally known facts "upside down." The "Eisenhower doctrine" is, in fact, flagrant violation of the United Nations principles. Its implementation would be tantamount to liquidation of the United Nations, because the United States would acquire unrestricted, dictatorial powers in this part of the world and would, in effect, deprive a number of UN member-countries of their independence.

American politicians justify their predatory aspirations by alleging that a "vacuum" has appeared in the Middle East. This is not the first time that they have advanced this not very original "vacuum" theory. The United States used it to justify the establishment of the aggressive North-Atlantic bloc. It was used later in Asia, when the United States formed the aggressive SEATO bloc there. Now, it appears, the "vacuum" has migrated to the Middle East. Is it not clear that the "vacuum" doctrine is dragged into the light every time the American ruling circles intend to ensconce themselves in some part of the globe?

The main motive at the basis of the "Eisenhower doctrine" is clearly imperialist in character. One cannot but see, however, that the plans of its authors are built on sand.

The colonial system has been radically undermined. It is crumbling under the mighty blows of the great national-liberation struggle waged by the peoples. Only those who indulge in pipe dreams can believe that, if the hour of British and French colonialism has struck in the Middle East, colonialism of the United States of America is bound to replace it. The imperialists forget that there is in this world, including the Middle East, the chief motive force of history. And this chief motive force is *His Majesty the People.* (*Prolonged applause.*)

It is high time that the myth that the United States is not a colonial power was exploded. The American monopolists have long been exploiting as colonies the countries of Latin America and the Philippines. They did their utmost after the Second World War to seize new positions in Europe, Asia, Africa, the Pacific and in the Middle East. Their penetration of the Middle East and North Africa is now entering the decisive stage. Whereas a bare ten years ago leading American statesmen asserted that the frontier of the United States national interests passed along the Rhine, today some of them seem to consider this to be the minimum claim. The appetite of many American politicians has grown immeasurably. They would like to extend America's control to all continents. But, as the saying goes, "there's many a slip between the cup and the lip." (*Applause.*)

In any case, the greater the geographical zone of American expansion, the deeper and sharper the contradictions in the camp of imperialism, the greater the people's hatred of and resistance to the foreign enslavers, the more vulnerable the position of the United States itself. The "Eisenhower doctrine" is a striking illustration of the fact that the United States is now

assuming the role of *principal bulwark of the system of colonial oppression.*

The antagonism between the United States and Britain and between the United States and France is becoming more and more pronounced. The United States ruling circles are intent not only on ousting their rivals. The aim is to turn Britain, and France, too, from "junior partners" into "senior vassals."

To this should be added that in recent times the contradictions in the capitalist world linked with the rising importance of Western Germany are steadily growing. Western Germany has already outstripped Britain, to say nothing of France, in output of important items, and first of all iron and steel, taking the second place in the capitalist world. She ranks third for coal output. Now Western Germany obviously aims at replacing Britain as the second largest exporter, after the United States. Thus the Federal Republic has already become a strong and dangerous rival of Britain and France.

One cannot but see that the ruling circles of Britain and France are strengthening Western Germany at their own expense. They support the plan for the "common market" for Western Europe. It may be that in so doing some people anticipate raising an obstacle to further United States economic penetration of Western Europe. But there is no doubt that should the "common market" be established, it would be dominated by Western Germany.

It is worth recalling in this connection that Western Germany has already achieved the leading position in the earlier established West-European economic pools such as the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Payments Union.

Furthermore, the governments of Britain and France are getting ready to implement the American plan for a so-called West-European community for atomic materials—"Euratom." Here, too, they are playing into the hands of the West-German imperialism which, through the medium of "Euratom," intends to dominate production of atomic energy in Western Europe in general and manufacture of nuclear weapons in particular.

In these circumstances the broad public in Britain and France cannot but feel alarm at the rapid consolidation of West-German militarism. General Speidel was recently appointed Commander-in-Chief of the NATO ground forces in Central Europe. Thus things have reached the stage where former Nazi generals are to command British and French soldiers within the framework of the North-Atlantic bloc.

One of the sources of the accentuated capitalist contradictions in the Far East is the growing strength of Japan. Her industrial output is now more than twice pre-war. She is working hard to extend her exports, especially to Asian countries, and to crowd out her competitors, primarily Britain. At the same time the majority of the people and influential circles in the country are displaying greater resolution in their desire to rid their country of United States dictatorial control and to ensure her independence.

And so the present stage is marked by a considerable exacerbation of contradictions between the principal capitalist powers. This exacerbation is enhanced by the peculiarities of the capitalist world economy which develops in a most uneven way. The rate of growth of output in some of the principal capitalist countries has come to a standstill or has slowed down. Artificial prim-

ing of the economy by the armaments race, huge government strategic stock-piling and unhealthy expansion of consumer credit and instalment sales no longer gives the desired effect, and the action of the inexorable laws governing the capitalist cycle becomes increasingly felt.

The two main branches of industry in the United States, which influence the whole trend of industrial production, showed a big drop last year. Automobile production fell by 27 per cent and house building by 16 per cent. The national debt and private debts reached a record of 693,000 million dollars, almost double the national income. No wonder that more and more warning voices are heard in the United States, saying that the situation is fraught with the most dangerous consequences for the economy and finance. None other than Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey cautioned the other day that continued inflation would lead to a "depression that will curl your hair," while former President Hoover, whose tenure in office spanned the great crisis of 1929, added: "Mine has already been curled once—and I think I can detect the signs." (*Laughter.*) Ridiculing those who contend that economic laws have become outmoded and that the United States has entered a crisis-free era, Hoover said: "Unless we curb inflation on its way up, old man economic law will return with full equipment of hair curlers." (*Animation in the hall.*)

Thus the instability, common to capitalist economy, is unmistakably growing. In these circumstances the struggle of the capitalist countries for markets becomes infinitely more bitter.

It has long been known that the strategists of imperialism try to blunt and, so to speak, offset the contradic-

tions within their own camp by stepping up the policy of aggression and ventures against the socialist camp. Take, for instance, the NATO Council session held recently in Paris. It was marked by profound contradictions between the principal members of this aggressive organization on whose façade many large cracks have appeared. And yet the common platform which has kept them together was the policy of conspiring against the socialist countries and the attendant policy of stepping up remilitarization of Western Germany.

It would seem that the emergence of West-German revanchists in NATO's front ranks has turned the head of some people. Consider, for example, the statement by the Federal War Minister Strauss published recently in the West-German magazine *Der Spiegel*: "We live in a technological age when the combined forces of our allies are enough to wipe the Soviet Union off the geographical map."

What can one say about these insane ravings? Only this: "*Your arms are too short!*" (*Applause.*) And it would seem that the Strauss' have short memory. They have forgotten the lessons of the recent war. And they should not be forgotten. I say this only because it is necessary, not because I want to intimidate anyone. We are not in the habit of rattling the sabre or uttering threats. We would, however, counsel the Strauss' to restrain themselves, to be more careful in what they say, to remember Bismarck's apt words: "Stupidity is a gift of the gods, it should not be abused." (*Laughter, applause.*)

We are a peace-loving people, but we can stand up for ourselves and deliver a crushing rebuff to any aggression. (*Prolonged applause.*) We are doing and we shall continue to do everything to foil the plans of those who

dream of a new war. In this struggle we draw inspiration from the fact justly stressed in the Joint Soviet-Chinese Declaration that "the combined peace strength of the socialist states, the independent nations and other peace-loving peoples greatly exceeds the strength of the aggressive imperialist blocs. It is sufficient for all possible peace-loving forces on the international arena to rally together, to combine their efforts in a determined struggle to foil once and for all any designs of the aggressive imperialist circles." (*Applause.*)

IV. FOR PEACE, FRIENDSHIP AND CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE NATIONS

Guided by its concern for maintaining and strengthening peace, the Government of the U.S.S.R. feels itself obliged in the present complicated international situation once more to call on the nations and governments to make constructive efforts in the interests of peace.

We, Soviet people, are not utopians but realistic politicians. And when we set ourselves the task of ensuring lasting peace we believe that this is feasible, although the way ahead is beset by not a few difficulties and obstacles.

At the present moment the question of whither international relations are to develop acquires decisive importance. It is common knowledge that the American ruling circles furnish a definite answer to this question. They advance their own scheme of international relations.

What, then, are the elements which comprise this scheme? They are these:

The United States of America shall assume the "role of energetic world leadership"; this role shall be exercised on all the continents of the globe; it shall be based on the steadily growing military might of the United States. Further, according to this scheme, there is but one security problem in the world—the security of the United States. However, since in reality no one is threatening it anywhere, the authors of the scheme have invented the highly original theory of "inter-dependence" according to which U.S. national security cannot be assured unless it is predominant in Europe and Asia, in the Middle East and the Pacific.

It is impossible not to see that the "world order" projected by the United States leads not to a settlement of international relations, but to their artificial aggravation. It signifies not peaceful co-existence of countries belonging to different social systems, but heating up the "cold war," intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries, subversion against the socialist states and all other countries which stand for strengthening peace. It presupposes not abolition of the colonial system, but, on the contrary, a vast colonial basis for the United States world empire. Lastly, it envisages an ever faster armaments race in general, and nuclear weapons in particular.

Can there be the slightest doubt that international relations conducted in this spirit would be fraught with dangerous complications and conflicts?

Humanity is vitally interested in seeing that this does not happen. The peoples want completely different international relations. They insist that the principle of peaceful co-existence should prevail in the international arena. In keeping with this demand the Soviet Government

displays and will continue to display in its policy the greatest restraint, patience and persistence. It will not fall for any provocation whatever. It will use every opportunity to avert new complications and conflicts. It persistently seeks a settlement of the vital international problems on which the preservation and strengthening of peace depend.

Above all the Soviet Government believes that it is vitally necessary to continue to seek a solution of two major tasks in international relations. I have in mind first, *disarmament*, and second, *collective security in Europe and Asia.*

The Government of the Soviet Union is doing everything possible to ensure a solution of the *disarmament problem* that would provide a firm basis for peace. As mentioned earlier, on November 17, 1956, the Government of the U.S.S.R. advanced a new disarmament programme. This programme is distinguished by its universal nature, embracing as it does all the components of the disarmament problem, and by its concreteness since perfectly practical businesslike proposals are made for each component, with due consideration for the respective positions of the Western Powers.

Recently we learnt from the speech made by the U.S. representative in the Political Committee of the United Nations General Assembly about the counter-proposals of the United States Government. The Soviet Government is making a due study of all aspects of these proposals. Here I shall dwell only on a few points.

In the first place it should be noted that, as hitherto, the United States obstinately refuses to conclude an agreement banning nuclear weapons. Instead, it confines itself to general statements about a desire to see atomic

energy used solely for peaceful purposes. But when it is a matter of a concrete agreement banning nuclear weapons or of steps leading to a ban, the United States gives a categorical refusal.

The usual explanation offered is that it is necessary first to reach agreement on armaments control. But no one denies the importance of control. The need for reasonable and effective forms of inspection is universally acknowledged. Given good will it would be easy to agree on that. Hence the usual American argument that it is necessary first to agree on control and only afterwards tackle disarmament sounds less and less convincing, and more and more people are beginning to realize that the leading United States circles do not want agreement with other states on banning nuclear weapons. In this matter it is clear that the U.S. military circles whose strategic plans hinge on nuclear weapons are taking the upper hand. What is perplexing, however, is the amazing light-mindedness of those who ignore one simple thing—that the United States and the American people are no less interested in banning nuclear weapons than, for instance, the Soviet Union and the Soviet people.

Atom bombs are a danger to humanity. All countries and all nations are confronted with the question: what is to be done about atomic weapons? That is the gist of the matter. We propose to ban atomic weapons altogether. The Soviet proposals call for the destruction of the existing stockpiles of atom and hydrogen bombs and for the creation of conditions that would preclude the possibility of manufacturing them. The United States Government is against.

What is more, there is much talk now in the United States about the intention of the American Government to

send to the territory of other countries neighbouring the U.S.S.R. special task forces equipped with atomic weapons. In particular there are plans to station these forces in Western Europe, Turkey, Iran, Japan, and on Okinawa Island. It goes without saying that any country, whether in Europe, or in the Middle or Far East, which would agree to grant its territory for United States atomic task forces, would assume full responsibility for the consequences arising therefrom.

Thus, instead of banning atomic weapons, official American circles are taking a path which increases the threat of an atomic war.

Further, while the Soviet Union has suggested banning test explosions of nuclear weapons, the United States Government has refused to agree to this too.

Nor are matters any better with regard to the United States stand on reducing conventional armaments. It has rejected a substantial reduction in armed forces until outstanding international problems, including the German problem, are solved. But this approach signifies that the entire disarmament problem is deadlocked, inasmuch as a radical reduction in the armed forces of the Great Powers would be an important prerequisite for a settlement of the fundamental political problems at present dividing the world.

In connection with the next steps in the sphere of disarmament, mention should be made of the special responsibility which rests with the United Nations. Evidently some people incline to the view that the United Nations' mission is to organize merely the process of disarmament discussions. But this is a grave mistake stemming from the erroneous practice of the League of Nations. Not interminable debates on disarmament but *concrete*,

positive results in disarming—that is the sole criterion for assessing how successfully the United Nations is coping with its mission. Settlement of the disarmament problem cannot be delayed any longer. Time is on the wing. The United Nations will not fulfil its mission if it does not make 1957 a year of substantial progress in this matter.

The second link which, if grasped, would greatly strengthen peace, is *collective security in Europe and Asia.*

It is clear without wasting words how great and urgent is the need for collective security in Europe where the establishment of a general European system of collective security would be in keeping with the vital interests of every country, big and small. It is also common knowledge that no one is against the United States participating in this system, though it is not a European country.

The question of European security has been discussed at a number of international conferences and in the press for years past, and not a few concrete proposals have been advanced by all sides. A study of these proposals shows, that, given the desire, a plan for a settlement acceptable to all could be elaborated.

It follows from what has been said that the time has come really to pool the efforts of all who are for a settlement of the long pressing question of creating firm guarantees of peace in Europe and the necessary conditions for stable economic co-operation between all the European countries.

The time has come, too, for further initiative in the matter of collective security in Asia and the Pacific. It is doubtful whether anyone will deny now that at the historic Bandung Conference the Afro-Asian countries made a valuable contribution to strengthening world peace. The principles proclaimed at Bandung are meeting with increas-

ing recognition and support. The solidarity displayed by the Asian countries on numerous questions has, unquestionably, paved the way for an effective collective security system in Asia.

It is necessary in this connection to stress once again the importance of the idea advanced by the Heads of Government of the Republic of India and the Chinese People's Republic for a collective peace agreement between the countries of Asia and the Pacific to replace the present military blocs there. It can hardly be doubted that if the solution of this question depended solely on the countries in Asia and the Pacific basin, an all-embracing system of collective security would have been established long ago in this area.

It is necessary to dwell specially on the question of security in the *Middle East*. Who would risk arguing about its exceptional importance and urgency? This is proved by the entire course of events in the post-war period. Now that the world has witnessed the Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggression against Egypt, that the "Eisenhower doctrine" has been made public, this question has become most urgent.

Spokesmen of influential Western circles allege that the threat to the Middle East countries emanates from the Soviet Union. This is the usual propaganda stunt of the imperialists. The more they themselves interfere in Middle East affairs to restore the vile colonial system and perpetuate their domination in this area, the more they clamour about alleged Soviet meddling in these affairs.

Comrade Deputies, yesterday the Government of the Soviet Union approached the Governments of the United States, Britain and France with a proposal to work out

and adopt the "*Basic Principles of a Declaration by the Governments of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain and France on Peace and Security in the Middle East and Non-Interference in the Internal Affairs of the Countries in This Area.*

The Soviet Union has advocated and advocates now the necessity of ensuring stable peace and an atmosphere of trust in the Middle East area. The Soviet Union does not have, nor does it want, military bases or concessions in the Middle East countries for the purpose of extracting profit, does not want any privileges in this area, since this is incompatible with the principles of the Soviet foreign policy. It is sincerely interested in strengthening the national independence of the countries in this area, in their economic prosperity, in seeing peace and tranquility in the Middle East area, which is in direct proximity to the border of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government holds that through the joint efforts of the Great Powers — the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and France—permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, it is possible to ensure durable peace in this area.

In keeping with this the Soviet Government suggests that the Governments of the United States of America, Britain and France should take upon themselves the obligation to abide by the following principles in their policy in the Middle East:

1. Preservation of peace in the Middle East by settling controversial questions solely by peaceful means and by way of negotiation.

2. Non-interference in the internal affairs of the Middle East countries, respect for the sovereignty and independence of these countries.

3. Renunciation of any attempt to involve these countries in military blocs with the participation of the Great Powers.

4. Closing down foreign bases and withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of the Middle East countries.

5. Reciprocal refusal to deliver arms to the Middle East countries.

6. Aid in furthering economic development of the Middle East countries without any political, military or other conditions incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these countries.

It goes without saying that this Declaration would be open to any country interested in peace and security and desirous of basing its relations with the Middle East countries on the aforesaid principles.

The Soviet Government would have no objection to the Governments of the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union issuing separate identical Declarations on their relations with the countries of the Middle East, based on the above principles.

The Government of the Soviet Union expresses the hope that this initiative, dictated by sincere concern for consolidating peace in the Middle East, will be supported by the Governments of the United States, Britain and France.

As regards the question of eliminating the consequences of the Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggression against Egypt, the urgent thing is complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from Egyptian territory. It is clear to everybody that full responsibility rests with the Israeli Government and its protectors for any consequences that may arise from the continued occupation of part of Egyptian territory.

The Soviet Government supports Egypt's just demands for full compensation for the damage caused to the country. The Soviet people were and remain opponents of any infringement of Egypt's inalienable rights by removing the Suez Canal from Egyptian sovereignty and establishing any foreign administration for the waterway. Law and justice are wholly on Egypt's side. The question of freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal can be solved only through negotiations between the countries concerned and on the basis of respect for Egyptian sovereignty and with due consideration to the just interests of all the canal users.

An important feature of the present international situation is the ever-growing number of countries in Europe, Asia and the Middle East coming out for peace and neutrality or beginning to side with this policy. These countries are not taking part in exclusive military blocs of aggressive intent. It is not fortuitous, therefore, that the proponents of the "cold war" and the "positions of strength" policy sneer and jeer at the policy of neutrality.

In the view of the Soviet Government it is necessary to give attention at this juncture especially to certain economic problems and above all to the creation of favourable conditions for world trade. It is high time to convene a *world economic conference* which could discuss the questions: further development of international trade and the setting up of an international trade organization under the auspices of the United Nations; international economic co-operation to help create independent national economies in the underdeveloped countries, and also certain financial questions. There can be no doubt that the holding of a world economic conference would benefit international relations.

Comrade Deputies, everybody knows that the main responsibility for safeguarding peace and international security rests with the Great Powers—members of the historic coalition which defeated the fascist hordes and, by so doing, saved civilization. Were the Great Powers—members of this coalition—to re-establish mutual confidence and good relations, humanity would heave a sigh of relief, conscious that the world was no longer threatened with grave danger.

Mindful of this, the Soviet Union is ready with all good will to study any initiative conducive to mutual understanding with the United States, Britain and France. One's attention cannot but be drawn in this connection by the statement made by United States President Eisenhower on January 23: "Everything else fades to unimportance besides this one: that we do make progress toward better understanding..." President Eisenhower emphasized that he had in view "particularly better understanding with the Russians, the Russian Government; and finally agreements in which we could all trust them." Nor should one disregard the statement made by British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd, who said a day earlier: "We have to start again to procure the easing in world tension which had been achieved nine months ago.... Although it must frankly be confessed that there is a cause for anxiety over the situation in many parts of the world, I believe that there are also great opportunities to be grasped."

We agree that these great opportunities exist and that they should be utilized.

In view of this it is only natural to return to a question the importance of which is obvious to everyone, namely, future relations between the U.S.S.R. and the *United*

States of America. The myth is circulated by certain circles abroad that normalization of Soviet-American relations is unthinkable because insoluble problems divide the two countries. In reality it is quite well known that our two countries have lived in peace and friendship for decades. Except for the period of foreign intervention against the young Soviet Republic, the United States and the Soviet Union have never fought each other. The late President Franklin Roosevelt stressed that for more than a century a happy tradition of friendship existed between the two nations, a tradition beneficial to both sides. A break was made with this tradition only when United States ruling circles began to reach out more and more towards world domination, a tendency which precluded equal international co-operation.

The Soviet Government holds as hitherto that no matter how the social systems of the U.S.S.R. and the United States may differ, there are not a few vital points on which the interests of our nations coincide. Both the American and the Soviet people are equally interested in safeguarding peace and in peaceful co-operation. Proceeding from this we have suggested to the United States a treaty of friendship with the Soviet Union. A year has passed since we made this proposal, but so far no reply has been forthcoming, which, of course, is not a chance matter. There are influential circles in the United States interested in sowing discord between our two countries. We, however, make a distinction between these circles and the American people, and we are convinced that sooner or later the common sense and sober thinking of the American people will triumph over the egoistic considerations of those who want to add to the tension in American-Soviet relations.

In recent years relations between the U.S.S.R. and *Canada* have enlivened somewhat, both in the economic sphere and in scientific-technical and cultural exchanges. The Soviet-Canadian Trade Agreement, signed in Ottawa in February last year, has played an important role in extending commercial contacts between the two countries. Given the appropriate desire on both sides, relations between the U.S.S.R. and Canada could, without question, continue to develop favourably.

If the matter is approached from the standpoint of strengthening peace and business co-operation among nations then there are opportunities for improving economic and cultural relations between the U.S.S.R. and the *Argentine*, *Mexico*, *Uruguay* and other *Latin American* countries. We would like to see an improvement in our relations with these countries.

The Soviet Union and *Britain*, as well as the Soviet Union and *France*, have many common interests. If there are controversial issues, and such, of course, there are, what is to prevent us from combining our efforts to solve them? In any case, the legitimate interests of Britain and France will, undoubtedly, be appreciated by the Soviet people and the Soviet Government, provided these countries display the necessary understanding of the Soviet Union's interests.

Of late the *problem* of *Algeria* has become the question of the day for France. Our stand in the matter is absolutely clear. We hold that every nation has the inalienable right to national freedom, independence and self-determination. This applies in full also to the Algerian people. At the same time one cannot deny the existence of definite, historically shaped relations between France and Algeria. These relations make possible

the solution of the Algerian problem in the interests of both the Algerian and the French people. Why has not this possibility been utilized yet? Why has the Algerian question developed into one of international urgency?

The French people are not to blame for this. The chief reason is that the French ruling circles have long refused to explore ways and means of settling the Algerian question in the spirit of the times and in the interests of the peoples. Their policy has led and is leading now to an aggravation of the already serious situation in Algeria. Meanwhile, the United States monopolies, keenly interested in the way things are going, play on the French Government's blunders and mistakes in order to step up their penetration of North Africa.

The Algerian problem calls for a more constructive policy on the part of France, one that would take into account the national interests of the Algerian people, and their right to independence. An Algerian settlement in this spirit would, unquestionably, help improve the international situation.

It is hardly necessary to go into details to prove the special importance of stable friendly relations and peaceful co-operation between the Soviet and the German people—this should be clear to everyone. Relations between the Soviet Union and the *German Democratic Republic*, as is known, are developing on the unshakable foundation of friendship. Freed from the yoke of imperialist monopolies and the burden of militarism, the German Democratic Republic is confidently advancing along the road of building socialist society.

Our relations with the *Federal Republic of Germany* are far from what is dictated by the interests of the two states. The Soviet Government is ready to meet the

Federal Republic halfway if it, on its part, displays a sincere desire for friendly co-operation with the Soviet Union.

Militarization and forming revanchist armed forces now pursued in Western Germany are obstacles in the way of co-operation. No matter from what angle we assess this policy it flagrantly contradicts the fundamental national interests of the German people. Every additional billion spent on armaments, every new division, will, undoubtedly, be a heavy burden on Western Germany and complicate her position in the international arena, increase distrust and suspicion towards her on the part of other countries, particularly her neighbours. For the Federal Republic this will delay a solution of the chief national problem of the German people: restoration of a united Germany on a democratic, peaceful basis.

It is common knowledge that certain external forces are impelling Western Germany in every way towards still greater militarization. They calculate that if a big and powerful military machine can be established in Western Germany and afterwards set in motion, this will enable some people to evade responsibility for preparing and instigating a new world war, to shelter themselves at a distance and divert the retaliatory blows in the direction of the German people. In our days, however, there is not, nor can there be, a comfortable, unattainable corner beyond the reach of the punishing hand of a just retribution. (*Applause.*)

But the question arises: why should Western Germany pull the chestnuts out of the fire for any instigator? Do not the lessons of their history tell the German people that Germany must never return to the policy of aggression and international gambles? And can there be any

doubt whatever that, having again embarked on this road, the Federal Republic stands to *lose everything* and gain nothing?

On February 8, the Soviet Ambassador in Bonn delivered a message to Federal Chancellor Adenauer from Comrade Bulganin, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, setting forth important considerations concerning the further development of relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. We emphasize that the interests both of the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic call for a radical change from mutual distrust and even certain hostility to relations of confidence and friendship.

The Austrian State Treaty and *Austria's* declaration of permanent neutrality are of great significance for peace in Europe. The Soviet Union supports Austria's neutrality and independence. It is our intention to continue to develop friendly relations with this country. It should be noted, however, that certain recent actions by the Austrian Government hardly coincide with the position of neutrality adopted by that country. Attention is drawn, for instance, by such facts as the use of Austrian territory by the imperialist forces which organized the counter-revolutionary plot against the people's democratic system in Hungary, the banning of international democratic organizations in Austria, such as the World Federation of Trade Unions and the World Peace Council. We think that strict observance of the State Treaty and of the principles of neutrality is in the interests above all of Austria herself.

Comrade Deputies, the Soviet Union wants peace and tranquillity on its borders. We have always striven and shall strive in the future for friendship with all the

neighbour states, and we hold that their social and political system, even if it differs from our own, is no obstacle to the establishment of sincere and friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

The Soviet people are highly gratified at the growing mutual understanding and strengthening of friendly co-operation with the *Republic of India*. The foreign policy pursued by the Republic of India, which remains outside military alliances and consistently advocates a peaceful solution of pressing international problems, is a striking example of the genuine peace policy which has won for the Indian Government headed by Mr. Nehru the respect and prestige it deserves. The Soviet Government intends in the future, too, to develop all-round friendly co-operation with the great Indian power on the basis of the five principles of peaceful co-existence. (*Applause.*)

As I have already said, the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and *Japan*, our Far Eastern neighbour, is a major contribution towards normalizing international relations. It goes without saying that normalization of relations between Japan and the Chinese People's Republic would also be of great significance. We are deeply convinced that strengthening Japan's friendship and co-operation with the Soviet Union and China corresponds to the interests not only of the three neighbour countries, but of all Asian countries.

The foundations have now been laid for mutually beneficial economic and trade relations between the Soviet Union and Japan, for sharing experience in science, technology and culture.

We note with satisfaction the strengthening of our invariably good-neighbourly and friendly relations with

Afghanistan. These relations are developing successfully on the basis of respect for mutual interests. Afghanistan is a peace-loving country pursuing a policy of neutrality and non-participation in aggressive military blocs. This policy meets with the support and approval of the Soviet peoples and of all the peace-loving nations. We sincerely wish more success to friendly Afghanistan on her road to progress. (*Applause.*)

The Soviet Government believes that relations between the Soviet Union and *Iran* can be developed in the spirit of friendship and mutual understanding. This is confirmed by the recent visit to the Soviet Union of His Majesty the Shah of Iran, the tour of the Soviet Union by the Iranian Parliamentary delegation, and by the warm welcome accorded to the Soviet Parliamentary delegation in Iran.

It should be said, however, that in Iran, and especially beyond her borders, there are forces striving to complicate and worsen Soviet-Iranian relations. We believe that all obstacles to the strengthening of good-neighbourly relations and friendship can be surmounted through the joint efforts of our two countries. (*Applause.*)

As regards our relations with *Pakistan*, the Soviet Government has repeatedly stated its desire for friendly relations with this country which is situated in the vicinity of the U.S.S.R., despite the negative significance of its participation in the aggressive SEATO bloc and the Baghdad pact. True, the relations between our countries are far from being what they should be. It goes without saying that this development calls for good will also on the part of the Pakistani Government.

Relations between the Soviet Union and *Turkey* should, in our view, have been cleared long ago of everything alien, of the load of prejudices of all kinds. The soon-

er the Turkish ruling circles realize this, the quicker Soviet-Turkish relations will improve. For its part the Soviet Government is ready to discuss with the Turkish Government any proposals aimed at establishing sincere and genuinely good-neighbour relations between them, relations which would conform to the interests of the two peoples.

Our relations with *Finland* can serve as an example of the fruitful results yielded by the policy of friendship and all-round peaceful co-operation between two neighbouring nations, despite the difference in their social systems. These relations are steadily improving and growing stronger, as indicated also by the expanding economic, scientific, cultural and sports contacts. We are justified in saying that the Soviet-Finnish Treaty of Friendship, Co-Operation and Mutual Aid concluded in 1948 has stood the test of time. It is an important factor for the security of Finland and also the north-western frontiers of the Soviet Union; it helps consolidate peace in Northern Europe.

The Soviet Union, faithful to the cause of peace, is anxious to maintain friendly relations with *Sweden*, *Norway*, *Denmark* and *Iceland*. Assurance of unbreakable peace and friendship with all countries in Northern Europe corresponds to the interests of the Soviet Union and the Northern states, and to the interests of European security. (*Applause.*)

* * *

Comrade Deputies, we regard our past efforts on the international arena, efforts devoted to the triumph of the ideas of peace, freedom and democracy, with feelings of joy and pride for our country, for our great nation—

the nation of builders—for our Party and Soviet Government. And this is perfectly understandable. Those seeds of "the reasonable, good and eternal," we have scattered in the international field, are yielding an abundant harvest.

The forces of peace and social progress are growing and gaining strength on all continents. They are, in ever growing measure, capable of curbing the dark forces of reaction and aggression. The zone of imperialist domination with its system of exploitation, colonial enslavement and racial discrimination is steadily shrinking.

And this is far from being a result of the "subversive activities of world communism" as persistently parroted by some Western politicians. No, it is a result of the operation of the irrevocable laws of social development according to which a new social system, a young system full of strength and creative vigour replaces the old outdated social system suffering from an incurable illness. (*Applause.*) Consequently there is no need for us to "undermine" capitalism. It is being "undermined" by the relentless *inner forces* of the mode of production based on exploitation of man by man.

Convinced of the inevitable and universal triumph of the principles of genuine human freedom, equality and fraternity of the nations, we shall firmly and consistently pursue our peaceful foreign policy. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

We suggest to the ruling circles of the Western Powers: Let us really effect universal disarmament. Let us destroy and prohibit for ever the most modern destructive weapons of war. Let us trade and share scientific and cultural values. Let us, through peaceful endeavour and eco-

nomic competition, demonstrate to which social system belongs the future. (*Applause.*)

But as long as our persistent peace initiative encounters obstinate resistance on the part of the ruling circles of the main Western Powers, we shall take good care to strengthen our glorious Armed Forces and keep a firm grip on our rifles. (*Stormy applause.*) And not only the rifle. We are fully aware of the fact that in the century of atomic energy, jet technique, electronics and telemechanics, our economic, technological, scientific and military arsenals must tune with modern requirements.

With this in mind we shall calmly and confidently continue our grand constructive effort to build communist society for the happiness of our people, in the name of peace and general social progress. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

DECISION
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.

on the Report by the U.S.S.R. Foreign Minister D. T. Shepilov on the International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union

Having heard and discussed the report by the U.S.S.R. Foreign Minister and Deputy Shepilov on the international situation and the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics *decides*:

To approve the foreign policy of the Soviet Government.

Chairman of the Presidium
of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

K. VOROSHILOV

Secretary of the Presidium
of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

M. GEORGADZE

The Kremlin, Moscow
February 12, 1957

Document generated by Anna’s Archive around 2023-2024 as part of the DuXiu collection (https://annas-blog.org/duxiu-exclusive.html).

Images have been losslessly embedded. Information about the original file can be found in PDF attachments. Some stats (more in the PDF attachments):

{
  "filename": "NDAyMjA1MjEuemlw",
  "filename_decoded": "40220521.zip",
  "filesize": 13580305,
  "md5": "a186cf31d8b3793c1d3a4b2b1fc3a9bc",
  "header_md5": "595040ba1d69cb2980f1d9fa31cdd8b8",
  "sha1": "e22543038086e6cfbc659a2b1303837dc4547eab",
  "sha256": "7ae301162ba9a1688f6b848c334eed71d5d438cf58b71800a009ed72690ac35e",
  "crc32": 233249113,
  "zip_password": "",
  "uncompressed_size": 14859809,
  "pdg_dir_name": "The international situation and the foreign policy of the soviet union_40220521",
  "pdg_main_pages_found": 58,
  "pdg_main_pages_max": 58,
  "total_pages": 60,
  "total_pixels": 175222656,
  "pdf_generation_missing_pages": false
}